

Serial No. 09/885,362

- 2 -

Art Unit: 2829

extends between said probe assembly and said semiconductor support fixture..." A similar amendment was made to claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-22, 32-39 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cadwallader et al. (U.S. Patent 6,043,667).

Cadwallader:

Cadwallader describes a substrate tester and method of testing in which the tester moves the substrate to be tested into precise location within the tester prior to making contact with fragile tester pins. The substrate is then clamped into a precise X-Y location relative to the tester contact pins, also without making contact with the tester pins. Next, the substrate top surface is moved quickly to a precise Z axis location, whereupon the tester contact pins are finally applied to the substrate using Z-axis motion only. In addition, a mechanism is included that features a cam-pivot arm micro-switch combination to sense when a product is not properly positioned in or missing from the test station. (Cadwallader, Abstract).

Cadwallader describes, at column 14 lines 15-25:

"... a camera-probe fixed distance stroke for use during alignment. Referring again to Fig. 13, TV camera 230 is mounted on a slide plate 250 a fixed distance 'A' from test head probe assembly 120 which is also mounted on slide plate 250..."

In contrast, claim 1 recites "...a machine vision system having a camera for locating said semiconductor device, said machine vision system having a first contact surface adjacent said

Serial No. 09/885,362

- 3 -

Art Unit: 2829

first surface of said probe assembly, said first contact surface having a first attachment mechanism to *selectively attach or detach said probe assembly and said machine vision system.*”

The structure of Cadwallader, which mounts the probe and the camera on the same slide plate 250, neither describes nor suggests a mechanism wherein the machine vision system is selectively attached or detached from the probe assembly as recited in claim 1. Independent claim 35 also includes a similar limitation and is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-33 and 35-50 serve to add further patentable limitations to their parent claims, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons put forth above with regard to their parent claims.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cadwallader et al as applied to claim 1 and above in view of Frankeny et al (U.S. Patent 4,975,637).

Frankeny describes a method and apparatus for testing integrated circuits, wherein a ferromagnetic test substrate is manufactured, to create the integrated circuit devices to be tested, such that the test substrate and the integrated circuit devices are thermally matched. By aligning the ferromagnetic test substrate and integrated circuit device to be tested in a position proximate to an electromagnet and selectively energizing the electromagnet, the electrical contact points within the ferromagnetic test substrate are magnetically urged into contact with the integrated circuit. (Frankeny, Abstract).

Thus, Frankeny describes a method of contacting a test substrate and an integrated device.

Serial No. 09/885,362

- 4 -

Art Unit: 2829


In contrast, Applicants note that the electromagnet of Claim 6 is used to limit the 'first attachment' device of claim 1, which is used to "selectively attach or detach said probe assembly and said machine vision system.." No such structure is shown or suggested in Frankeny, Cadwallader or the combination thereof. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claims 6 and 7 are patentably distinct over the references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Lindsay G. McGuinness, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

11/10/2003
Date


Lindsay G. McGuinness, Reg. No. 38,549
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. CORE-69 120-322

Dd: 11/8/2003